



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 88/221,704 | 04/01/94 | HORST | FEH090 |

RATNER & PRESTIA
100 N. GULPH ROAD
P.O. BOX 980
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482

31M1/1002

| LE, M EXAMINER | |
|----------------|--------------|
| | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 3103 | 10 |

DATE MAILED:

10/02/95

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/221,704

Applicant(s)

Horst et al

Examiner

Mark Tuan Le

Group Art Unit

3103



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Tuan Le (3) _____
(2) Mr. Casey (4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 27, 1995

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Claims 3-17 were indefinite because it was not clear in the preambles of the claims as to whether the control system was intended to be claimed in positive connection with the locomotive. However, in view that the bodies of these claims clearly set forth the positive structural connections with the locomotive, the examiner proposed to amend the preambles of these claims to clearly set forth positive connection with the locomotive so as to be consistent with the bodies of the claims.

The examiner also proposed the cancellation of claims 19-24 because claims 3-18 and claims 19-24 were related as combination and subcombination, respectively, and a restriction requirement would be made if claims 19-24 were not cancelled.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.